DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 284 335 EA 019 540

AUTHOR Knoop, Robert
TITLE Causes of Job Dissatisfaction among Teachers.
PUB DATE Jun 87
NOTE 24p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Canadian Society for Studies in Education (Hamilton, Ontario, Canada, May 31-June 3, 1987).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Elementary Secondary Education; Employer Employee Relationship; Foreign Countries; *Job Satisfaction; Life Satisfaction; Need Gratification; Research Needs; School Surveys; Self Esteem; *Teacher Alienation; *Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Behavior; *Teacher Motivation
IDENTIFIERS *Ontario

ABSTRACT

Job dissatisfaction may manifest itself in frustration for the teacher and defense mechanisms for the employer. Previous research suggests that unfulfilled needs, goals, and value expectations, as well as the lack of achievement of outcomes, account for job dissatisfaction. Other variables include demography, disillusionment with life, lack of participation in decision-making, and absence of considerate leader behavior. Due to a plethora of hypotheses, variables, specific dimensions, and measuring instruments, research offers only a limited comprehension of job dissatisfaction. In a recent survey, questionnaires completed by 894 elementary and 971 secondary school teachers from 17 Ontario school boards revealed that few respondents were dissatisfied; demography was generally insignificant; dissatisfaction was associated with external control, low self-esteem, an absence of humanistic work values, disappointment in life, and an absence of particular job characteristics; alienation from teaching and lack of job motivation were the most powerful predictors; and teachers wished instruction to be more challenging. To make teaching more challenging, differentiated levels of teachers could be introduced; to avoid alienation and advance motivation, differentiated staffing could be combined with alternant leadership; and, to prevent excessive centralization, private schools could be encouraged. Attached are 64 references and 4 tables. (RG)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED284335

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Robert Knoop

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

# CAUSES OF JOB DISSATISFACTION AMONG TEACHERS

Robert Knoop
Brock University

Paper presented to the
Canadian Society for the Study of Education

Hamilton, Ontario

June 1987

EA 019 540

## INTRODUCTION

Since centrality of work seems to become an increasingly important expression of human nature, knowledge of employee attitudes toward work, particularly of negative and unpleasurable feelings, can prevent behaviors that have negative consequences for both the individual and the organization. Job dissatisfaction is one such attitude.

For the employee, job dissatisfaction can result in feelings of gloom, apathy, despair, anger, resentment, fatigue, poor mental and physical health. These feelings in turn can lead to responses of frustration: aggression, regression, fixation, bickering, complaining and psychological withdrawal (Kavanagh, Hurst, & Rose, 1981; Jamal & Mitchell, 1980). For the employer, job dissatisfaction can result in a variety of defense mechanisms: decreased performance, tardiness, absenteeism, turnover, early retirements and strikes (Breaugh, 1981; Adler & Golan, 1981; Arnold & Feldman, 1982). One consequence of job dissatisfaction alone, absenteeism, has been estimated to be as high as $26 billion, in US businesses and industries (Steers & Rhodes, 1978). Put succinctly, job dissatisfaction hurts the individual and the organization.

The purpose of this research was to determine and examine factors that cause job dissatisfaction in education. Readers, particularly those who consider themselves experts at this topic, may consider such effort redundant in light of the vast amount of research that investigated the phenomenon. However, even though job satisfaction is probably one of the most widely researched concepts in organizational psychology--Locke (1976) estimates that over 3300 studies had been conducted and reported by 1976-- our understanding of what it is, what it affects, how widespread it is, and how it manifests itself, is limited. Not only is there no real theory of job satisfaction or dissatisfaction, but a great diversity of conceptual and operational definitions exists.

## NATURE OF DISSATISFACTION

Pinder (1984) identified four prevailing approaches which attempt to explain the general nature of job dissatisfaction. The first approach, advocated by Loftquist & Dawis (1969), and Morse (1953) considers job dissatisfaction a function of need satisfactions, an emotional reaction to blockages of attempts to satisfy one's needs on the job. Blockages, advocates of this approach claim, can be caused by such factors as organizational

policies, supervisors, colleages, too much work, lack of abilities, age, psychological preferences, wrong expectations, working hours, or a shortage of resources. The nature of the needs that can lead to blockages is said to vary. Growth needs, challenge, stimulation, more opportunities for self actualization, for achievement, for competence--all of these needs can lead to dissatisfaction if not fulfilled. In short, under the needs approach employees consider to what degree the forces of work are useful for satisfying their needs.

The second approach views job dissatisfaction as the discrepancy between what one expects to receive from work and what one perceives to be actually receiving (Ilgen, 1971; McClelland, Atkinson, Clark, and Lowell, 1953). This approach is based on Vroom's (1964) original view of VIE (Expectancy-Instrumentality-Valence) theory of motivational explanations in human behavior that makes within-person, not between-person, comparisons.

Equity theory led to a third, between-person, approach to job dissatisfaction. Here dissatisfaction results if a person makes comparisons with others. It prevails when the relationship between contributions made to the organizaion and benefits derived from it are less than those for some other person.

From the most defensible aspects of content and process theories of job motivation (a distinction made by Campbell & Pritchard, 1976), Locke (1976) synthesized a fourth approach by defining job dissatisfaction as the degree to which the job prevents fulfillment of important job values, provided these values are congruent with one's needs. This definition bridges content and process theories. Unmet values, those things conducive to one's welfare, are considered key determinants of job dissatisfaction because, if absent, they cannot give directions for the satisfaction of needs.

THE PORTER & LAWLER MODEL

Porter and Lawler (1968) combined VIE and equity explanations of job satisfaction into a model that comes closest to a theory. Their aim was to explain the relationship between satisfaction and performance which had previously been found to be positively related in 17 out of 20 studies, with a median correlation of .14 (Vroom, 1964).

According to their model, past performance leads to rewards. Job satisfaction, or dissatisfaction, depends on the levels of internal and external outcomes and on how the job holder perceives these outcomes. Intrinsic outcomes are

considered events which follow from people's own efforts, from behavior performed for its own sake, that results in competence (Deci, 1975) and originates what Maslow calls higher-order needs. Extrinsic outcomes do not have these qualities and do not belong to the person but come from the organization. According to this model, work outcomes have different valences for different people. A person is dissatisfied to the extent rewards are perceived as unfair and inequitable. This accounts for different levels of job satisfaction for the same tasks; what is satisfying to one person is not necessarily satisfying to another. The relationship between satisfaction and performance is reciprocal: performance leads to rewards and satisfaction; satisfaction, in turn, influences performance.

Hence, the Porter and Lawler model shows that job dissatisfaction and poor performance are only indirectly related. One study (Knoop, 1981), which conceptualized effectiveness in terms of degree of goal accomplishment, found school effectiveness, one measure of performance, significantly correlated with intrinsic, but not extrinsic, facets of job satisfaction: with coworkers who assist and stimulate teachers to improve their teaching, and with supervisors who influence interpersonal relations, school climate, and the working environment. This study seems to suggest that in education movement along the continuum from job dissatisfaction to satisfaction may be an indicator of performance. What is not clear is whether this relationship is restricted to facet satisfaction or extends to overall satisfaction.

HERZBERG'S VIEW

Herzberg's (1959) insistence on two separate dimensions to account for satisfaction and dissatisfaction Locke (1976) finds indefensible. According to Herzberg, bad feelings leading to dissatisfaction are associated with contextual variables like pay, promotion, relations with supervisor, status, or security. Potential causes of job satisfaction stem from the work itself and from provisions like responsibility, achievement and recognition.

Despite the support Herzberg's work received, the results are said to be explained mainly by the methods used to gather and analyze the data, the theory being merely an artifact of the method used to generate it (Korman, 1971). It seems not surprising that Miskel, Glasnapp & Hatley (1975), who developed a theoretical framework of work motivation based on Herzberg, were not successful in explaining a significant amount of variance in the concept. The position taken in this research is the traditional one which views job satisfaction and dissatisfaction as opposite

ends on the same continuum.

## FRUSTRATION FRAMEWORK

Maier's (1973) frustration framework is rather useful and insightful in dealing with negative work attitudes. It states that people tend to associate goals with satisfaction of their particular needs. Frustration sets in when learned behavior fails to reach the goals being sought. What causes frustration? According to Maier, causes can be external (organizational structure, boring and repetitive jobs, unfriendly coworkers, etc.) or characteristic of the person being frustrated (sex, age, education, etc.). Frustration of growth needs manifest themselves in job dissatisfaction.

To summarize, the various conceptual frameworks seem to suggest that job dissatisfaction is potentially caused by a large number of factors: by a variety of blockages to need satisfaction, by unmet value expectations, by unfulfilled goals, and by lack of achievement of intrinsic and extrinsic outcomes. Predictions made based on any one framework are bound to miss out on other predictors and can lead to only a small amount of explained variance in job dissatisfaction.

## RELATED RESEARCH

The diverse conceptual frameworks have naturally resulted in a large number of studies that relate job satisfaction and dissatisfaction to a myriad of variables. Only a few of those studies will be cited which relate directly to the variables of concern here.

Various demographic variables have been associated with dissatisfaction. Age of employees, particularly initial disappointment with the work teachers do, were recently found to be related to dissatisfaction (Galloway, 1985; Lowther, et al., 1985). Position, tenure, education, marital status and income--but not sex--have also been reported to relate to dissatisfaction (Weaver, 1978; Hunt & Saul, 1975; U.S. Department of Labor, 1974).

Dissatisfaction with life in general and job dissatisfaction were found to be associated. The relationship was interpreted in terms of spillover, or opiate, effects and compensatory relationships (Iris & Barrett, 1972; Kavanagh & Halpern, 1977). Yet the amount of variance explained was moderate: Near, Smith, Rice & Hunt (1984) reported only 3%.

More than 20 years ago March & Simon (1958) found job dissatisfaction closely related to lack of participation in decision making. This finding was confirmed more recently

in education (Sweeney, 1981; Knoop, 1986; Karasek, 1979). Elements of work design and structuring of activities, particularly lack of autonomy over work, had direct effects on job dissatisfaction (Weaver, 1978; Taylor, 1971). Lawler (1969) cautions though that for people who are happy to do repetitive, monotonous, and boring work, enriched work may bring about negative values and attitudes.

Absence of considerate leader behavior was found to be a good predictor of job dissatisfaction in a study of school superintendents (Brown & Bledsoe, 1978). Dissatisfaction with supervisors and coworkers (Farber, 1984) was also reported to contribute to overall dissastisfaction. Nord (1977) pointed out the importance of the dimensions alienation and powerlessness in future investigations of job dissastisfaction; he also emphasized the need for research to be more macro in scope and to lead to results more useful to practitioners.

## RESEARCH QUESTION

Thus each of the definitional approaches and conceptual frameworks outlined earlier has led to the formulation of different sets of hypotheses. Moreover, each approach involved a multitude of diffferent variables--from needs, expectations, goals, and values to personal characteristics. This multiplicity is intensified by the subdivision of job satisfaction into a variety of specific dimensions. For example, Smith, et al., (1969) identified five, Lofquist & Dawis (1969) twenty-one, Holdaway (1978) fifty-eight different dimensions of job satisfaction. Compounded by the variety of measuring instruments, each with its own problems of reliability and validity, it is not surprising that we have so far "only a limited understanding" (Pinder, 1984) of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction.

While it would be presumptuous to state that the present study will cure all ills, it nevertheless is an attempt to gain a bird's eye view. This view can only be obtained by going against some current research practices: to refrain from making specific predictions based on specific theories; to ignore the dimensionality of the concept and view it instead as a unitary concept; to explore the effect of a large number of possible predictors rather than of a few "proven" variables; and to analyze a large group of variables using regression procedures (an approach frowned on by statisticians). Furthermore, because of the many studies on satisfaction, it is difficult to delineate the present research properly to show how it fits in with previous investigations and to state precisely what it is expected to contribute.

A single question was posed: what causes dissatisfaction among teachers? Dissatisfaction was hypothesized to be a function of personal demographic, personal psychological, job characteristics, and work outcomes.

## METHOD

### SUBJECTS

The sample consisted of 894 elementary and 971 secondary school teachers from 17 school boards in Ontario. Questionnaires were distributed by 42 graduate students to all teachers in their own schools. While the method of data collection was therefore not random, a high return rate (83%) was achieved in each school.

Specific sample characteristics were as follows:

| Characteristics | | Elementary | Secondary |
|---|---|---|---|
| Age (Mean) | | 35 yrs. | 37 yrs. |
| Sex - male | | 41.3% | 66.4% |
| female | | 58.2% | 33.1% |
| Marital Status - | single | 21.6% | 18.3% |
| | married | 73.3% | 75.3% |
| | divorced | 3.7% | 5.4% |
| | widowed | .9% | .4% |
| Education - | no degree | 29.5% | 6.5% |
| | bachelor | 54.8% | 71.4% |
| | master | 14.7% | 21.1% |
| Experience - | overall teaching | 11.6 yrs. | 11.7 yrs. |
| | present school | 4.6 | 6.2 |
| | non-teaching | 60% | 53% |

### MEASURES

Job dissatisfaction was measured with Hoppock's (1935) four-item measure. This instrument seemed to be relevant to teaching: it is short, reliable and valid. As Locke (1976) pointed out, most researchers have followed Hoppock's example in using direct, verbal self reports to measure the variable.

The value labels Hoppock gave to the seven scale anchors are given below in condensed and combined form:

1 - I never feel satisfied with my job; I hate it and would quit at once if I could; no one dislikes his/her job more than I dislike mine.

2 - I seldom feel satisfied with my job; I dislike it and would take almost any other job in which I could earn as much as I am earning now; I dislike my job much more than most people dislike theirs.

3 - I occasionally feel satisfied with my job; I don't like it and would like to change both my job and my occupation; I dislike my job more than most people dislike theirs.

4 - I feel satisfied with my job about half the time; I am indifferent to it and would like to exchange my present job for another one; I like my job as well as most people like theirs.

5 - I feel satisfied with my job a good deal of the time; I like it and I am not eager to change my job, but I would do so if I could get a better job; I like my job better than most people like theirs.

6 - I feel satisfied with my job most of the time; I am enthusiastic about it and cannot think of any job for which I would exchange it; I like my job much better than most people like theirs.

7 - I feel satisfied with my job all the time; I love it and would not exhange my job for any other; no one likes his/her job better than I like mine.

A second measure of job satisfaction/dissatisfaction was employed as partial evidence of validity of the Hoppock scale. Kunin's (1955) Faces Scale asks respondents to circle one of five faces (from very satisfied to very dissatisfied) that best describe their feelings about a job. The Faces Scale has been found to be a fairly good measure of overall satisfaction (Aldag & Brief, 1981). The correlation between Hoppock's and Kunin's measures was r=.67 for the elementary sample and r=.73 for the secondary sample.

Other measures used in the opinion survey included the following:

- Satisfaction with supervision and coworkers: Aiken and Hage, 1966.
- Identification with the work organization: Patchen, 1965.
- Life satisfaction: Catril, 1965.

- Occupational values: Rosenberg, 1957.
- Locus of control: Rotter, 1966.
- Self Esteem: Rosenberg, 1965.
- Alienation from work (powerlessness): Pearlin, 1962.
- Job characteristics (core job dimensions): Hackman and Oldham, 1981.
- Leadership dimensions; consideration and initiation of structure; LBDQ Form XII: Schriesheim and Kerr, 1974.
- Job involvement: Lodahl and Kejner, 1965.
- Participation in decision making: Siegel and Ruh, 1973.
- Job motivation: Patchen, 1965.
- Closeness of supervision: Pearlin and Kohn, 1966.
- Organizational independence: House and Kerr, 1973.
- Alienation with teaching as a career: Aiken and Hage, 1966.

The reader is referred to these sources for reliability and validity estimates and for a description of the items used to measure the variables.

Demographic variables were coded in this manner: job status (1, teacher; 2 department head; 3 principal); education (1, no degree; 2, bachelor; 3, master); sex (1, male; 2, female); marital status (1, single; 2, married; 3, divorced; 4, widowed).

## RESULTS

### SATISFACTION-DISSATISFACTION

The percentage distribution of educators along the satisfaction-dissatisfaction continuum is shown below:

| Degree of Satifaction | Overall | Secondary | Elementary |
|---|---|---|---|
| Never | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Seldom | 0.3 | 0.5 | 0.0 |
| Occasionally | 1.8 | 2.0 | 1.6 |
| Half the time | 6.1 | 6.4 | 5.8 |
| Good deal of the time | 30.0 | 31.6 | 28.5 |
| Most of the time | 52.3 | 50.2 | 54.2 |
| All the time | 9.5 | 9.3 | 9.9 |

As can be seen from the data, only a small percentage of educators is dissatisfied with their job. If "half the time" is taken as cut-off point, only 8.2% of the teachers sampled felt dissatisfied. This percentage changes drastically (to 38.2%), however, if "a good deal of the time" is considered a far-from-perfect response. The differences between the two sample groups are non-significant.

DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

In Table 1 the means and standard deviations for both sample groups are presented. The groups were treated separately, rather than combined, because they differed significantly on some dimensions. The elementary panel consisted of more female educators, was slightly younger though not as well educated, had less experience outside teaching and fewer years of teaching in the same school, and held more favorable perceptions of job characteristics than the secondary panel.

Pearson correlations between job dissatisfaction and demographic variables (Table 2) were all non-significant with the exception of school size for elementary schools: job dissatisfaction increased with staff size ($r=.26$, $p<.001$).

Of the personal psychological variables, job dissatifaction was significantly correlated with an external locus of control, low self esteem, an absence of people-oriented work values, and dissatisfaction with life in general. Correlation coefficients ranged between $r=.15$ and .45, $p<.001$, for both samples.

Absence of certain job characteristics (skill variety, task significance, task identity, autonomy, feedback, and motivating potential of teaching) were also found to be significantly associated with dissatisfaction as were four process variables (consideration, initiation of structure, closeness of supervision, and participative decision making) with r's ranging from .12 to .47 ($p<.001$).

The highest correlations with job dissatisfaction were found for work outcomes: career alienation ($r=.41$ for elementary and .57 for secondary teachers), identification with the work organization ($r=.35$ and .39), satisfaction with the supervisor ($r=.33$ and .29), job involvement ($r=.32$ and .41), and job motivation ($r=.50$ and .44).

Overall, one can conclude that half the demographic and all of the personal psychological factors, situational job variables, and work outcomes were, for one sample or the other, statistically significantly, though not always meaningfully, correlated with job dissatisfaction. The findings substantiate and validate the choice of variables for this research.

Table 1

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS
BY TYPE OF SCHOOL AND VARIABLES INVESTIGATED

| | Elementary Panel (N=894) | | Secondary Panel (N=976) | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | M | SD | M | SD |
| Job Title | 1.43 | 1.11 | 1.53 | .97 |
| Education | 1.86 | .67 | 2.16 | .53 |
| Age | 35.02 | 8.25 | 37.00 | 8.74 |
| Sex | 1.58 | .49 | 1.33 | .47 |
| Marital Status | 1.84 | .54 | 1.88 | .49 |
| Overall Teaching Experience | 11.63 | 7.34 | 11.73 | 6.90 |
| Non-teaching Experience | 1.20 | 2.92 | 2.47 | 5.02 |
| # of Years in Present School | 4.65 | 4.31 | 6.25 | 4.56 |
| Income | 2.58 | 1.03 | 3.35 | .81 |
| Size of School | 20.26 | 13.19 | 76.27 | 44.77 |
| Location of School | 2.57 | 1.03 | 2.39 | .86 |
| Satisfaction with Life in General | 1.87 | .51 | 1.91 | .52 |
| Value: Self Expression | 4.43 | 1.65 | 4.51 | 1.57 |
| Value: People-orientation | 4.55 | 1.72 | 4.11 | 1.83 |
| Value: Extrinsic-reward | 1.96 | 1.32 | 2.03 | 1.39 |
| Locus of Control | 4.46 | 2.28 | 4.23 | 2.44 |
| Self Esteem | 9.11 | 2.51 | 9.14 | 1.21 |
| Feelings of Powerlessness | 1.05 | .97 | .98 | .98 |
| Job Characteristics: | | | | |
| Dealing with Others | 6.66 | .84 | 6.66 | .83 |
| Autonomy | 5.33 | 1.20 | 5.38 | 1.09 |
| Task Identity | 4.99 | 1.27 | 4.55 | 1.28 |
| Skill Variety | 5.68 | 1.21 | 5.39 | 1.31 |
| Task Significance | 5.65 | 1.23 | 5.20 | 1.26 |
| Feedback from Others | 4.24 | 1.35 | 4.06 | 1.42 |
| Feedback through Job | 5.41 | 1.35 | 5.13 | 1.19 |
| Motivating Potential of Job | 163.17 | 69.77 | 145.19 | 64.77 |
| Participative Decision Making | 18.40 | 3.90 | 17.85 | 3.71 |
| Closeness of Supervision | 10.71 | 2.86 | 10.87 | 2.27 |
| Leadership: People-orientation | 11.77 | 4.34 | 12.13 | 4.44 |
| Task-orientation | 11.04 | 4.63 | 11.90 | 4.81 |
| Job Involvement | 18.11 | 4.22 | 17.95 | 4.24 |
| Job Motivation | 15.14 | 2.61 | 14.93 | 2.53 |
| Alienation with Teaching as a Career | 15.76 | 3.14 | 15.43 | 3.15 |
| Satisfaction with Supervision | 3.13 | .94 | 2.98 | .98 |
| Satisfaction with Coworkers | 3.15 | .75 | 3.12 | .76 |
| Identification with School Board | 10.57 | 2.73 | 10.01 | 2.61 |
| Organizational Independence | 12.77 | 2.38 | 12.97 | 2.27 |
| Overall Job Satisfaction | 21.27 | 3.34 | 20.79 | 3.24 |

Table 2

PEARSON CORRELATIONS: JOB DISSATISFACTION WITH ALL VARIABLES

| Variable | Job Dissatisfaction is correlated with Elementary Panel (N=894) r | Secondary Panel (N=976) r |
|---|---|---|
| Low Status | .04 | .06 |
| Higher Education | .00 | .05 |
| Age | .00 | .00 |
| Being Male | .11 | .01 |
| Marital Status | .04 | .04 |
| Overall Teaching Experience | .04 | .02 |
| Non-teaching Experience | .00 | .02 |
| Too Many Years in the Same School | .02 | .05 |
| Income | .04 | .02 |
| Small School Size | .26 | .03 |
| Schools in Metro Areas | .02 | .05 |
| Low Satisfaction with Life in General | .29 | .34 |
| Values Emphasizing Self Expression | .06 | .00 |
| Absence of People-oriented Values | .23 | .25 |
| Values Emphasizing Extrinsic Rewards | .07 | .03 |
| External Locus of Control | .15 | .18 |
| Low Self Esteem | .45 | .19 |
| Feelings of Powerlessness | .25 | .33 |
| Job Characteristics that lack... | | |
| Dealing with Others | .10 | .13 |
| Autonomy | .26 | .25 |
| Task Identification | .22 | .20 |
| Skill Variety | .31 | .33 |
| Task Significance | .28 | .41 |
| Feedback from Others | .25 | .40 |
| Feedback through Job | .26 | .28 |
| Motivating Potential | .45 | .38 |
| Lack of Participative Decision Making | .47 | .46 |
| Closeness of Supervision | .45 | .37 |
| Leaders who are not Task-oriented | .20 | .17 |
| Leaders who are not People-oriented | .29 | .23 |
| Low Job Involvement | .32 | .42 |
| Low Job Motivation | .50 | .44 |
| Organizational Dependence | .12 | .22 |
| Alienation with Teaching as a Career | .41 | .57 |
| Low Satisfaction with Supervision | .33 | .31 |
| Low Satisfaction with Coworkers | .12 | .15 |
| Lack of Identification with School Board | .35 | .39 |

If $r > .05$, $p < .05$.

REGRESSION ANALYSES

In multiple regression analysis, the dependent variable, job dissatisfaction, was regressed step by step on the predictor variables which were examined at each step for entry or removal (p=.05). The variable with the largest F-value was retained first; then the rest of the variables were examined for removal. Overall, this procedure explained about 57 percent of the variance in job dissatisfaction for elementary and 54 percent for secondary teachers.

For elementary teachers (Table 3), low job motivation accounted for the largest portion of the variance in job dissatisfaction (25%), followed by alienation with teaching as a career (14%), low self esteem (6%), dissatisfaction with life in general (3%), lack of motivating potential of the job of teaching (2%), low job involvement (2%), lack of people-oriented values (1%), closeness of supervision (1%), and sex (male, 1%).

Table 3

STEPWISE MULTIPLE REGRESSION ANALYSIS
DEPENDENT VARIABLE: OVERALL JOB DISSATISFACTION
ELEMENTARY PANEL (N=894)

| Predictor Variable | $R^2$ | $R^2\Delta$ |
|---|---|---|
| Low Job Motivation | .25 | .25 |
| Alienation with Teaching as a Career | .39 | .14 |
| Low Self Esteem | .45 | .06 |
| Low Satisfaction with Life in General | .48 | .03 |
| Low Motivating Potential of Job | .50 | .02 |
| Low Job Involvement | .52 | .02 |
| Absence of People-oriented Values | .54 | .02 |
| Closeness of Supervision | .55 | .01 |
| Sex (Maleness of Educator) | .56 | .01 |
| Lack of Identification with School/Board | .57 | .01 |

All $R^2$ values are significant at $p < .05$

For secondary teachers (Table 3), alienation with teaching as a career explained 32% of the variance in job dissatisfaction, followed by low job motivation (9%), perceived insignificance of the tasks to be performed (5%), dissatisfaction with life in general (3%), lack of job involvement (2%), lack of identification with the work organization (1%), and lack of people-oriented values (1%).

Table 4

STEPWISE MULTIPLE REGRESSION ANALYSIS
DEPENDENT VARIABLE: OVERALL JOB DISSATISFACTION
SECONDARY PANEL (N=976)

| Predictor Variable | $R^2$ | $R^2_\Delta$ |
|---|---|---|
| Alienation with Teaching as a Career | .32 | .32 |
| Low Job Motivation | .41 | .09 |
| Lack of Task Significance | .45 | .04 |
| Low Satisfaction with Life in General | .48 | .03 |
| Low Job Involvement | .50 | .02 |
| Lack of Identification with School/Board | .51 | .01 |
| Absence of People-oriented Values | .52 | .01 |
| Organizational Dependence | .53 | .01 |
| Lack of Feedback through Job | .54 | .01 |

All $R^2$ values are significant at $p < .05$

Thus many of the variables which had high simple correlations with job dissatisfaction (e.g., lack of participative decision making, inconsiderate leadership, dissatisfaction with supervision) did either not explain any significant amount of the variance in the concept or explained only small amounts (e.g., closeness of supervision, absence of people-oriented values, lack of identification with the work organization).

## DISCUSSION

The macro approach followed in this research to examine causes of job dissatisfaction yielded a satisfactory amount of variance in the concept.

Combinations of variables found to explain chunks of variance in other studies did not survive the rigour of multiple regression when faced with a large number of competing variables. Age and tenure which explained 6% of the variance in job satisfaction in Hunt & Saul's (1975) study were not found to be significant predictors at all in this research. Similarly, considerate leader behavior which accounted for 5% of the total variance in Brown & Bledsoe's (1978) investigation showed significant simple correlations but were not significant as predictors. However, the results support Near, Smith, Rice & Hunt's (1984) finding that job satisfaction contributed 3% to the explained variance in life satisfaction, except that in the present

research life dissatisfaction predicted job dissatisfaction; the variance explained here was also 3%, for both samples. Of course, the question of which kind of dissatisfaction comes first remains unresolved.

## CORRELATES OF ALIENATION AND MOTIVATION

Alienation with teaching as a career and lack of job motivation were the two most powerful predictors of job dissatisfaction in both samples. Together they explained, on average, 40% of the variance. Yet the rank order of these variables differs for the two panels of educators. Lack of job motivation was the dominant predictor for elementary teachers, career alienation for secondary teachers.

Why do elementary teachers experience low job motivation, a force, Aldag & Brief (1981) claim, that flows from dissatisfaction? Intercorrelations (not shown) identified low self esteem (r=.51), closeness of supervision (r=.48), low job involvement (r=.42), lack of participation in decision making (r=.37), and low motivating potential of the job per se (r=.32) as the most important correlates of job motivation. Likewise, why are secondary teachers alienated from teaching? Work alienation related significantly with low satisfaction with supervision (r=.52), with lack of participation in decision making (r=.50), with being unable to identify with a particular school or board (r=.42), with experienced powerlessness (r=.36), with lack of performance feedback (r=.39), and with insufficiently considerate leadership (r=.36).

These initial trends suggested by correlation analysis need further clarification. Future research may want to examine other correlates of alienation and motivation.

## THEORETICAL IMPLICATIONS

What alternatives does theory have to suggest for decreasing job dissatisfaction?

Maier (1973) outlines two constructive reactions to need frustration. The first is problem solving. The dissatisfied individual engages in diagnosis of the problem itself, of its symptoms and causes, proposes solution strategies for overcoming feelings of frustration, and maps out effective action plans. The process itself can contribute to the satisfaction of growth needs and the product to the amelioration of the problem. A second way of coping with frustration is through the pursuit of alternative goals. Applied to alienation with teaching as a

career, for example, this could mean looking for another career. The need, a satisfying career, remains the same.

Its emphasis on rewards makes the Porter & Lawler (1968) framework less suitable for suggesting remedies suitable to education. Indeed, their model predicts that dissatisfied teachers may perform no worse than satisfied teachers. Coupled with Morgan's (1986) suggestion that organizations can be conceived as psychic prisons bound to create what Jung (1969) calls a shadow, we may not be able to do without a fair portion of dissatisfied teachers to represent the valid dysfunctional side of school boards. Conversely, if organizations are considered self producing systems, forms of narcissism that interact with projections about ourselves, then the high percentage of satisfied teachers is also not surprising.

While Herzberg's two-factor theory of work motivation may not be valid, his variables concerning job design suggest excellent solution alternatives. If one assumes that motivators can dissatisfy, such variables as low job motivation, low motivating potential, low self esteem, and high alienation can be counteracted by building into education more opportunities for achievement and recognition, more challenging and interesting work, or more responsibility and advancement.

## SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

I will now summarize the symptoms, identified in other studies, and the causes, found in this study, of job dissatisfaction, define the problem that would deal with the symptoms and address the causes, and suggest an action plan for practitioners.

As elaborated in the introduction, teacher dissatisfaction may result in undesirable behaviors for school boards: absenteeism, turnover, tardiness, grievances, and strikes. There is also some evidence of a linkage between dissatisfaction and poor performance. At the individual level, dissatisfaction may show itself in apathy, anger, resentment, complaints, aggression and stress.

Because job satisfaction-dissatisfaction was conceptualized as a range of feelings along one continuum, the problem is to devise strategies that make dissatisfied teachers more satisfied, that is, to establish conditions that lead to the fulfillment of important work values that are congruent with people's needs.

This research seems to suggest that teachers need and

value, in order of importance,

1. teaching as career to be more challenging;
2. higher levels of aroused motivation on the job, particularly at the elementary level;
3. at the secondary level, factors that promote self esteem;
4. tasks that are more significant, provide more feedback, and are more motivating;
5. more job involvement;
6. more organizational identification, that is, a sense of solidarity with other educators, especially with administrators;
7. more people-oriented values.

These conclusions and the recommendations that follow are based on the premise that a high enough percentage of the population is dissatisfied with their job and that it is worthwhile and desirable to improve their lot. This is by no means self evident since it can be argued that differentiation, states of being in opposition, creates necessary energy and tension (Neuman, 1954), or that disequilibrium is required as an important prerequisite for change (Lewin, 1951).

As mentioned earlier, one can also conclude that teachers are quite satisfied and that no change is necessary. Why change what satisfies the majority?

RECOMMENDED ACTION

One way of making teaching as a career and profession more challenging is to introduce differentiated staffing (Stoops, Rafferty & Johnson, 1975). Instead of having only one level of teachers, differentiated staffing provides for several levels. For instance, the position of teacher could be differentiated by education, experience, and performance into these five levels:

| | Minimum | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Position | Education (Degree) | Experience (Years) | Performance (Overall) |
| Apprentice Teacher | Bachelor + | 3 | average |
| Associate Teacher | Bachelor | 3 | average |
| Senior Teacher | Honours | 6 | average |
| Master Teacher | Master | 9 | above average |
| Expert Teacher | Doctoral | 12 | above average |

Differentiated staffing should cater to a variety of

higher and lower order needs of individuals--growth, esteem, achievement, competence, challenge, responsibility, status, pay--and could be structured in a way that would allow an expert teacher to earn a higher income than a superintendent. Aspiring to administrative positions would then not be the only alternative for upward mobility.

Needless to say, implementation of such a radical change as differentiated staffing would have to be carefully planned. Ministries of education, for instance, would have to ensure the availability of sufficient graduate programs to allow thousands of teachers to obtain their doctoral degree. (While this may sound frightening, a good percentage of teachers and administrators in other countries hold doctoral degrees, countries we compete with economically.) School boards could also design the roles of the proposed levels of teachers to coordinate with the different roles of administrators.

Differentiated staffing could be combined with alternant leadership--a system designed to prevent life-time appointments to positions of responsibility and to inject vitality, youth, new ideas and values into the school system (Knoop & Wagner, 1986)--to prevent alienation and promote motivation. There is no evidence to suggest that younger leaders fare worse than older leaders or, for that matter, that leaders in general, unless they are above average, have major effects on outcomes. As Smith, Carson & Alexander (1984) propose,

> If a change is likely to make no difference or at least will not harm the organization and there exists the possibility that the occasional exceptional leader might occupy that leadership position, why not change? Some leaders will influence organizational outcomes. (p. 775)

Lastly, and this proposal is extreme, one might argue that since education in most provinces is centralized to such a degree as to produce what Janis (1972) calls group think among teachers, some privatization of the industry is called for. Private schools, supported by public funding, could bring out entrepreneurial instincts among some teachers, possibly among those who at present are rather dissatisfied, and provide some refreshing competition to static, satisfied boards. It is recognized, however, that this notion, cherished as it is by the author, may not be born out by the results.

Given the sparseness of guidance theory provided, the amount of variance unexplained, and the potential moderator effects of variables as yet unexplored, future research

efforts into the nature and causes of job dissatisfaction require creativity and imagination.

## REFERENCES


Adler, S., & Golan, J. Lateness as a withdrawal behavior. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1981, 66, 544-554.

Aiken, M., & Hage, J. Organizational alienation: a comparative analysis. American Sociological Review, 1966, 31, 497-507.

Aldag, R., & Brief, A. Managing organizational behavior. St. Paul, Minn.: West Publishing, 1981.

Arnold, H., & Feldman, D. A multivariate analysis of the determinants of job turnover. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1982, 67, 350-360.

Breagh, J. Predicting absenteeism from prior absenteeism and work attitudes. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1981, 66, 555-560.

Brown, S., & Bledsoe, J. Job satisfaction of school superintendents as related to perceptions of leader's behavior. Psychological Reports, 1978, 42, 171-174.

Campbell, J. & Pritchard, R. Motivation theory in industrial and organizational psychology. In Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology, M. Dunnette, editor. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1976.

Cantril, H. The pattern of human concerns. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1965.

Deci, E. Instrinsic motivation. New York: Plenum Press, 1975.

Farber, B. Stress and burnout in suburban teachers. Journal of Educational Research, 1984, 77, 325-331.

Galloway, D., et al., Sources of satisfaction and dissatisfaction for New Zealand primary school teachers, Educational Research, 1985, 27, 44-51.

Hackman, R., & Oldham, R. Work redesign. Reading, M.A.: Addison-Wesley, 1980.

Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Snyderman, B. The motivation to work. New York: Wiley, 1959.

Holdaway, E. Facet and overall satisfaction of teachers,

Educational Administration Quarterly, 1978, 14, 30-47.

Hoppock, R. Job satisfaction. New York: Harper, 1935.

House, R., & Kerr, S. Organizational independence, leader behavior and managerial practices. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1973, 58, 173-180.

Hunt, J., & Saul, P. The relationship of age, tenure, and job satisfaction in males and females, Academy of Management Journal, 1975, 18, 690-702.

Ilgen, D. Satisfaction with performance as a function of the initial level of expected performance and the deviation from expectations, Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 1971, 6, 345-361.

Iris, B., & Barrett, G. Some relations between job and life satisfaction and job importance, Journal of Applied Psychology, 1972, 56, 301-304.

Jamal, M., & Mitchell, V. Work, nonwork, and mental health: a model and a test, Industrial Relations, 1980, 19, 88-93.

Janis, I. Groupthink. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1982.

Jung, C. The structure and dynamics of the psyche. Princeton: Bollingen Series, 1969.

Karasek, R. Job demands, job decision latitude, and mental strain: implications for job redesign, Academy of Management Journal, 1979, 24, 285-308.

Kavanagh, M., & Halpern, M. The impact of job level and sex differences on the relationship between life and job satisfaction, Academy of Management Journal, 1977, 20, 66-73.

Kavanagh, M., Hurst, M., & Rose, R. The relationship between job satisfaction and psychiatric health symptoms for air traffic controllers, Personnel Psychology, 1981, 34, 691-707.

Knoop, R. Job satisfaction of teachers and attainment of school goals, The Canadian Administrator, 1981, 21, 1-6.

Knoop, R. Causes of alienation among university professors, Perceptual and Motor Skills, 1986, 63, 677-678.

Knoop, R., & Wagner, J. Alternant leadership: increasing school system effectiveness, The Canadian Administrator, 1986, 25, 1-10.

Korman, A. Industrial and organizational psychology. Englewood

Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1971.

Kunin, T. The construction of a new type of attitude measure, Personnel Psychology, 1955, 8, 65-77.

Lawler, E. Job design and employee motivation, Personnel Psychology, 1969, 22, 426-435.

Lewin, K. Field theory in social science. New York: Harper, 1951.

Locke, E. The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology, edited by M. Dunnette, pp. 1297-1349. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1976.

Lodahl, T., and Kejner, M. The definition and measurement of job involvement, Journal of Applied Psychology, 1965, 49, 24-33.

Loftquist, L, & Dawis, R. Adjustment to work. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1969.

Lowther, M., et al., Age and the determinants of teacher job satisfaction, Gerontologist, 1985, 25, 520-25.

Maier, N. Psychology in industrial organizations. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1973.

March, J., & Simon, H. Organizations. New York: Wiley & Sons, 1958.

Miskel, C., Glasnapp, D., & Hatley, R. A test of the inequity theory for job satisfaction using educators' attitudes toward work motivation and work incentives, Educational Administration Quarterly, 1975, 11, 38-54.

McClelland, D., Atkinson, J., Clark, R., & Lowell, E. The achievement motive. New York: Appleton-Century Crofts, 1953.

Morgan, G. Images of organization. Beverly Hills: Sage Publ., 1986.

Morse, N. Satisfactions in the white-collar job. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, Survey Research Center, 1953.

Near, J., Smith, A., Rice, R., & Hunt, R. A comparison of work and nonwork predictors of life satisfaction, Academy of Management Journal, 1984, 27, 184-190.

Neumann, E. The origins and history of consciousness. New York: Princeton University Press, Bollingen Series, 1954.

Nord, W. Job satisfaction reconsidered, American Psychologist, 1977, December, 1026-1035.

Patchen, M. Some questionnaire measures of employee motivation and morale, Monograph, #41, Ann Arbor, Michigan, Institute for Social Research, 1965.

Pearlin, L. Alienation from work: a study of nursing personnel, American Sociological Review, 1962, 27, 314-326.

Pearlin, L., and Kohn, M. Social class, occupation and parental values: a cross-national study, American Sociological Review, 1966, 4, 466-479.

Pinder, C. Work motivation: theory, issues, and applications. Glenview, Ill.: Scott, Foresman, 1984.

Porter, L., & Lawler, E. Managerial attitudes and performance. Homewood, Ill.: Dorsey Press, 1968.

Rotter, J. Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement, Psychological Monograph, 1966, 80.

Rosenberg, M. Occupations and values. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1957.

Rosenberg, M. Society and the adolescent self-image. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1965.

Schriesheim, C., and Kerr, S. Psychometric properties of the Ohio State Leadership Scales, Psychological Bulletin, 1974, 81.

Siegel, A., and Ruh, R. Job involvement, participation in decision making, personal background and job behavior, Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 1973, 9, 318-327.

Smith, P., Kendall, L., & Hulin, C. The measurement of satisfaction in work and retirement. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1969.

Smith, J., Carson, K., & Alexander, R. Leadership: it can make a difference, Academy of Management Journal, 1984, 27, 765-776.

Steers, R., & Rhodes, S. Major influences on employee attendance: a process model, Journal of Applied Psychology, 1978, 63, 391-407.

Stoops, E., Rafferty, M., & Johnson, R. Handbook of educational administration: a guide for the practitioner. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1975.

Sweeney, J. Teacher dissatisfaction on the rise: higher level needs unfulfilled, Education, 1981, 102, 203-207.

Taylor, J. An empirical examination of a four-factor theory of leadership using smalles space analysis, Organizational Behavior and Human Performance. 1971, 6, 249-266.

U.S. Department of Labor. Job satisfaction: is there a trend? Manpower Research Monograph No. 30. Manpower Administration, 1974.

Vroom, V. Work and motivation. New York: Wiley, 1964.

Weaver, C. Sex differences in the determinants of job satisfaction. Academy of Management Journal, 1978, 21, 265-274.